

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5 and 7-10 are presented for consideration, with Claims 1, 9 and 10 being independent.

The abstract has been amended to better set forth the technical features of Applicant's invention. In the claims, independent Claims 1, 9 and 10, along with selected dependent claims, have been amended to further distinguish Applicant's invention from the cited art. Claims 2-4 and 6 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-4 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Sonobe '034. In addition, Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Sonobe in combination with Overton '495. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of Applicant's invention relates to a document display method comprising a determination step of determining whether or not an enlargement/reduction ratio for document data to be displayed is equal to or greater than a predetermined ratio, and an applying step of applying smoothing processing to image data based on the document data if it is determined that the enlargement/reduction ratio for the document data to be displayed is equal to or greater than the predetermined reduction ratio, and not applying the smoothing process to the image data based on the document data if it is determined that the enlargement/reduction ratio of the document data to be displayed is less than the predetermined reduction ratio. In addition, the image data to which the smoothing process has been applied or not applied is displayed.

Claims 9 and 10 relate to a document display apparatus and a computer-readable recording medium, respectively, and have been amended along the same lines as Claim 1. These claims thus also apply smoothing processing to image data based on the document data if it is determined that the enlargement/reduction ratio for the document data to be displayed is equal to or greater than the predetermined reduction ratio, and do not apply the smoothing processing if the enlargement/reduction ratio is less than a predetermined reduction ratio.

Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, beginning on page 6, line 19 of the specification. In accordance with Applicant's claimed invention, a high performance display of data can be achieved.

The primary citation to Sonobe relates to a method and device for smoothing an image that is enlarged by two or more times. As understood, the image is smoothed by shifting the enlarged image with the original image and performing AND and OR operations between the shifted images to obtain a smooth enlarged image.

Sonobe does not, however, apply a smoothing operation to a reduced image, and thus fails to teach or suggest, among other features, making an enlargement/reduction ratio determination and applying smoothing processing to image data if it is determined that the enlargement/reduction ratio is equal to or greater than a predetermined reduction ratio, and not applying the smoothing processing if it is determined that the enlargement/reduction ratio is less

than the predetermined reduction ratio. These features are provided in each of Applicant's independent Claims 1, 9 and 10.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Sonobe fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention, and therefore reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

The secondary citation to Overton relates to a pixel correction and smoothing method and is relied upon for its teaching of providing a fixed condition of an image containing characters. Overton fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Sonobe as discussed above with respect to Applicant's independent claims. Therefore, the proposed combination of Sonobe and Overton, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claims 1, 9 and 10 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 5, 7 and 8 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM/rnm

FCHS_WS 1468657v1